

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 93 04:30:19 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #12  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Mon, 4 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 12

## Today's Topics:

430mhz band under th  
ysical Data Broadcast for 03 January

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1993 04:25:44 GMT  
From: uw-coco!nwnexus!ole!ssc!tad@beaver.cs.washington.edu  
Subject: 430mhz band under th  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C09tnA.8vA@iat.holonet.net> [bwilkins@iat.holonet.net](mailto:bwilkins@iat.holonet.net) (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>In California we generally talk simplex on repeater outputs in the 440  
>band. This is done to minimise interference. Our repeaters can cover  
>distances in the hundreds of miles due to high elevation sites. Most  
>repeater users monitor the output not the input. We had a couple of new  
>hams 100 miles away using our input as a secret channel. Funny that they  
>used the same PL we used...we heard them quite clearly...provided lots of  
>amusement. They could not hear any of us on their portables so we had a  
>ham in their community call them on frequency. He asked them to switch  
>modes and operate duplex. They were properly embarrassed when they realized  
>that their private comms were being carried in a large area. When told  
>that they could operate on our output they were quite happy.

>  
>As gentlemen we have agreed in concept that when operating on a repeater  
>output we have a secondary use. If the repeater comes up, we stand by .

>the user of the repeater who is 100 miles away cant hear us. The bands are  
>divided up into sub-bands simplex ssb packet repeater etc. When operating  
>simplex in the repeater sub-bands we are a secondary use to the coordinated  
>use. New users of the 440 band dont realize that their radios only cover a  
>third of the band! most of the simplex use is in the 431 - 433 MHz spectrum.  
>

I noticed this type of operation on 2 meters when I was visiting AH6BK's place on Kalepa Point on Maui a few years ago. The locals would chat on simplex on the repeater output, and then move to duplex when they got out of range. It was an interesting way of doing things.

>

--  
Tad Cook | Phone: 206-527-4089 (home) | MCI Mail: 3288544  
Seattle, WA | Packet: KT7H @ N7DUO.WA.USA.NA | 3288544@mcimail.com  
| Internet: tad@ssc.com or...sumax!ole!ssc!tad

-----

Date: 4 Jan 93 08:15:24 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Daily Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for 03 January  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

!!BEGIN!! (1.0) S.T.D. Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for DAY 003, 01/03/93  
10.7 FLUX=125 90-AVG=139 SSN=078 BKI=5435 3333 BAI=024  
BGND-XRAY=B3.3 FLU1=2.1E+06 FLU10=9.8E+03 PKI=5445 3433 PAI=024  
BOU-DEV=082,050,030,071,023,027,031,032 DEV-AVG=043 NT SWF=00:000  
XRAY-MAX= C6.4 @ 0001UT XRAY-MIN= B2.9 @ 2359UT XRAY-AVG= B5.0  
NEUTN-MAX= +001% @ 2000UT NEUTN-MIN= -003% @ 2115UT NEUTN-AVG= -1.0%  
PCA-MAX= +0.1DB @ 0915UT PCA-MIN= -0.4DB @ 1015UT PCA-AVG= -0.0DB  
BOUTF-MAX=55424NT @ 0419UT BOUTF-MIN=55385NT @ 1957UT BOUTF-AVG=55409NT  
GOES7-MAX=P:+119NT@ 1929UT GOES7-MIN=N:+000NT@ 1018UT G7-AVG=+073,+029,+009  
GOES6-MAX=P:+140NT@ 1931UT GOES6-MIN=E:-039NT@ 1257UT G6-AVG=+091,-002,+039  
FLUXFCST=STD:128,130,135;SESC:128,130,135 BAI/PAI-FCST=018,018,010/018,018,012  
KFCST=3335 6333 3335 6333 27DAY-AP=005,014 27DAY-KP=2111 2321 2233 4334  
WARNINGS=  
ALERTS=  
!!END-DATA!!

-----

Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1993 04:22:55 GMT  
From: uw-coco!nwnexus!ole!ssc!tad@beaver.cs.washington.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec30.114623.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <1993Jan02.061920.7115@ssc.com>, <1993Jan2.133936.1@ttd.teradyne.com>  
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan2.133936.1@ttd.teradyne.com> rice@ttd.teradyne.com writes:  
>In article <1993Jan02.061920.7115@ssc.com>, tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:  
>> In article <1992Dec30.114623.1@ttd.teradyne.com> rice@ttd.teradyne.com writes:  
>>>  
>>>That's not what I said. What I said was that any Ham has the right by law  
>>>to transmit on any frequency for which he is licensed. Period. The repeater  
>  
>>>operator has the right to turn off the machine. Period.  
> -----  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>> Let me see if I have this straight (!)..... :)  
>>  
>> I get my 440 MHz link set up, and get a coordinated frequency from  
>> the local coordination council. Everything works fine, until one  
>> day YOU show up and start transmitting there.  
>>  
>> And \*I\* have to turn off my gear??  
>>  
>> I don't think so!  
>>  
>Read what I wrote. You don't HAVE to DO anything. But if you don't want  
>the station to be repeated, you have the right to not do so.  
>  
>But if the frequency is not in use at the time you have no exclusive right  
>to say who can or cannot transmit on that frequency. And nothing in part  
>97 implies that you have that right.  
>

Nope, you're wrong. Otherwise, why would we need coordination?

>  
>

--  
Tad Cook | Phone: 206-527-4089 (home) | MCI Mail: 3288544  
Seattle, WA | Packet: KT7H @ N7DUO.WA.USA.NA | 3288544@mcimail.com  
| Internet: tad@ssc.com or...sumax!ole!ssc!tad

-----

Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1993 04:13:14 GMT  
From: uw-coco!nwnexus!ole!ssc!tad@beaver.cs.washington.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec30.114623.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <1993Jan02.061920.7115@ssc.com>, <1993Jan3.011010.8108@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>  
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan3.011010.8108@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov (Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:  
>In article <1993Jan02.061920.7115@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:  
>>  
>>Let me see if I have this straight (!)..... :)  
>>  
>>I get my 440 MHz link set up, and get a coordinated frequency from  
>>the local coordination council. Everything works fine, until one  
>>day YOU show up and start transmitting there.  
>  
>>And \*I\* have to turn off my gear??  
>>  
>>I don't think so!  
>>  
>Of course you don't HAVE to turn your gear off. Just don't whine about him  
>using your repeater.  
>

Why do you characterize jamming a link freq as "using your repeater"??

>

--  
Tad Cook | Phone: 206-527-4089 (home) | MCI Mail: 3288544  
Seattle, WA | Packet: KT7H @ N7DU0.WA.USA.NA | 3288544@mcimail.com  
| Internet: tad@ssc.com or...sumax!ole!ssc!tad

-----  
Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1993 04:11:55 GMT  
From: uw-coco!nwnexus!ole!ssc!tad@beaver.cs.washington.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec30.234200.11309@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993Jan02.061145.6961@ssc.com>, <1993Jan3.010814.7938@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>

Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan3.010814.7938@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov

(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

>In article <1993Jan02.061145.6961@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

>> Second, section (e) refers to

>>>\*ancillary\* functions of repeaters and the ability to limit access to

>>>those \*ancillary\* functions to certain user stations. This doesn't

>>>address closed repeaters where the \*primary\* function of the repeater

>>>is restricted.

>>>

>>

>>You're confused. The ability of a licensee to limit access to

>>his station is NOT confined to ancillary functions.

>>

>Of course he can limit access to the primary function, BY TURNING IT OFF!

>No one has argued with that, only that there is no legal reason to prevent

>someone from using repeater FREQUENCIES that are not otherwise in use with

>ACTIVE TRANSMISSIONS. Suppose hams A & B start a QSO on the output of repeater

>C. If repeater C subsequently starts to operate and interferes with the QSO,

>which is NOT USING THE REPEATER ITSELF, then it is the repeater (or its users)

>that are guilty of interference.

Nope! This tactic was tried in LA by jammers in the 1970s...and it didn't work. They figured they had found a loophole....since the repeater was not transmitting on top of THEM. No one was amused!

>Of course it would be rude and ignorant to use repeater frequencies for this, >but since when does that have anything to do with law? When the "simplex" QSO >(or whatever) is finished, and the repeater comes into use, then once again >\_it\_ holds the channel.

>

>Are you reading the same posts I am?

>

Gosh, I \*THINK\* so.....but maybe not!

Are we talking about AMATEUR radio, with people who have some idea of the history of the development of FM repeaters and coordination?

Regarding simplex QSOs.....of course no one is going to get in big trouble by accidentally stumbling across the odd frequency or input. But I thought we were talking about a bunch of folks on this newsgroup who think they have found some loophole to harrass operators of links, closed repeaters, or any other spectrum usage that they don't like.

>

--  
Tad Cook | Phone: 206-527-4089 (home) | MCI Mail: 3288544  
Seattle, WA | Packet: KT7H @ N7DUO.WA.USA.NA | 3288544@mcimail.com  
| Internet: tad@ssc.com or...sumax!ole!ssc!tad

---

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #12

\*\*\*\*\*